Remarks/Arguments

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-10 are pending in the application of which claims 6-10 are withdrawn from consideration and that claims 1-5 stand rejected. The Applicants have herein amended claims 1-4 to more clearly define the invention of the Applicant.

In view of the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that none of these claims 1-5 now pending in the application are rendered obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections

A.   35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected the Applicants' claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkinson (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0164149 A1) in view of Cornog et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0009172 A1, hereinafter "Cornog"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants amended the claims herein to more clearly define the invention of the Applicants. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the Applicants' figures 1-2 and in the Specification on page 3, lines 22-29.

The Applicants submit that Wilkinson discloses storing material, i.e. video, audio or data essence, in a store such as a digital tape recorder or a digital disc recorder. In Wilkinson, the material is combined with digital data structured into a data structure having a key field, a length field and a value field, the value field containing the digital data (see Wilkinson, [0006]-[0008]).

The Applicants submit, however, that Wilkinson nowhere mentions or discloses that the digital data recorded in the value field is indicative of the length of the material with which it is combined. More specifically, the Applicants' claim 1 specifically recites:

> "Method for recording data, said method being implemented on a video recorder and comprising the steps of:
> - recording, using said video recorder, a data container having a container length;
> - recording, after the data container and using said video recorder, a key indicative of a back-pointer;

- 3 -

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498   **PATENT**
Serial No. 10/537,463   **PF020159**
Final Office Action dated: 7/22/10
Response dated: 8/19/10

                 - recording, after the key and using said video recorder, a length indicator;
and
                 - recording, after the length indicator and using said video recorder, a
value indicative of the container length."

The Applicants submit that Wilkinson absolutely fails to teach or suggest
"recording after the length indicator and using said video recorder, a value indicative of
the container length" as taught and claimed by the Applicants. The Applicants further
submit that, as conceded by the Examiner that Wilkinson absolutely fails to teach or
suggest "recording, after the data container and using said video recorder, a key
indicative of a back-pointer" as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

More specifically, the Applicants submit that at least two features render the
Applicants' claim 1 novel over Wilkinson and that such features are linked in that they
allow for recording, after a data container, a back pointing KLV item having said key
indicative of a back-pointer which allows for interpreting the KLV item's value indicative
of the container length as a relative pointer to the start of the preceding data container
such that the preceding data container can be read backwards (see Applicant's
Specification p.5, l. 1-6).

For rapidly locating specific data, e.g. video frame starts, in a file body, Wilkinson
teaches MXF files having a file header and a file footer in addition to the file body; the
file footer comprising an index table (record) and the file header comprising header
metadata and an index table (playback) wherein the index tables are optional metadata
sets (see Wilkinson, Fig 1 and [0056]-[0057]).

The Applicants would like to point out to the Examiner that Wilkinson nowhere
mentions or discloses that said optional metadata sets are KLV encoded metadata
sets. Wilkinson further teaches repetitively distributing the header metadata through
the file body which has an advantage of allowing random access to data within the file
body (see Wilkinson, [0075] and [0077]). However, although Wilkinson mentions that
header metadata may be any technical data relating to essence contained in the file
body (see Wilkinson, [0060] and [0062]), Wilkinson remains silent that such header
metadata may comprise a KLV item with a value indicative of a container length and a
corresponding key indicative of a back-pointer as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Since Wilkinson suggests non-KLV encoded metadata sets representing index
tables for rapid access, Wilkinson does not provide any reason to the skilled person for

- 4 -

looking to Cornog or other prior art in order to usefully improve Wilkinson such that backward reading operability is achieved as taught and claimed by the Applicants. That is, the Applicants submit that there is absolutely no motivation to combine the teachings of Cornog with the teachings of Wilkinson to attempt to teach the invention of the Applicants.

The Applicants further submit that, even if assumed arguendo that the skilled person would have looked at Cornog in order to improve Wilkinson to attempt to teach the invention of the Applicants, the teachings of Cornog absolutely fail to bridge the substantial gap between the teachings of Wilkinson and the invention of the Applicants. That is, the skilled person, in combining the references, would have used one of the several methods for creating an index as described in the DETAILED DESCRIPTION of Cornog for creating the index tables of Wilkinson. At most, that would have resulted in an index that stores information defining the relative position of each element in the file body (see Cornog, [0005]) with a disk offset pointing to the beginning of the content package (see Cornog, [0023]) being indicated by a letter in the index (see Cornog, [0022]). The index letter would indicate the disk offset itself but would not be a key indicating that a subsequent value is indicative of the disk offset. The Applicants submit that Cornog absolutely fails to teach or suggest recording the relative position in a value field of a KLV item as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

The Applicants submit that Cornog refers to the Key-Length-Value (KLV) format definition given by the Society of Motion Picture Television Engineers (SMPTE) standard 336M-2001 as an example format in which an element may store data indicative of its own length (see Cornog, [0023]). However, according to such definition the data is indicative of the elements own length but not of the length of a preceding data container. Further, the Applicants would like to emphasise an argument already given when dealing with the Chadwick reference cited in the last office action: With respect to the Key, Cornog solely refers to the definition given by the Society of Motion Picture Television Engineers (SMPTE) standard 336M-2201 and remains silent regarding any extension of Key specification beyond the SMPTE standard 336M-2201.

However, the Applicants submit that at the time the Applicants' invention was conceived, the SMPTE standard 336M-2201 did not specify any unique 16 byte universal label indicative of any pointer, particularly no label or

- 5 -

"key indicative of a back-pointer",

as taught in the Applicants' Specification and claimed by at least the Applicants' claim 1. The Applicants further submit that none of the publications referred to by Cornog specify any such pointer, particularly no back-pointer, indicating key as taught in the Applicants' Specification and claimed by at least the Applicants' claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that the technical features of the Applicants' claimed invention, and specifically at least the Applicants' claim 1, which are not taught by Wilkinson cannot be suggested by Cornog alone or in view of common knowledge, which renders the Applicants' invention, at least as claimed in claim 1, non-obvious over Wilkinson in view of Cornog even in further view of common knowledge.

Therefore and for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicants submit that Wilkinson in view of Cornog fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' claimed invention, and, specifically, "recording, after the data container and using said video recorder, a key indicative of a back-pointer", and, "recording, after the length indicator and using said video recorder, a value indicative of the container length", arranged as in at least the Applicants' claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicants' claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Wilkinson and Cornog, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Likewise, the Applicants' independent claim 4 claim similars relevant features, as claimed in the Applicants' claim 1. As such, the Applicants submit that claim 4 is also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Wilkinson and Cornog, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, the Applicants' dependent claims 2-3 and 5 depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicants' independent claims 1 and 4 and recite additional features thereof. As such, the Applicants submit that at least because the Applicants' claims 1 and 4 are not rendered obvious by the teachings of Wilkinson and Cornog, alone or in any allowable combination, the Applicants further submit that the Applicants' dependent claims 2-3 and 5, which depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicants' claims 1 and 4, are also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Wilkinson

- 6 -

PATENT
PF020159

and Cornog, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

The Applicants reserve the right to establish the patentability of each of the claims individually in subsequent prosecution.

Conclusion

Thus the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are rendered obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicolaas Johannes Damstra et al.

By:

Jorge Tony Villabon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 52,322
(609) 734-6445

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

August 19, 2010

- 7 -